

[REDACTED] See ECF 84-1;  
ECF 84-2 [SEALED]. The records show [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] *Id.* [SEALED]. At least in the Silver  
Spring Atlantic Guns store, the sales numbers [REDACTED] *Id.* [SEALED].  
Excluding the two aberrant years of [REDACTED] Atlantic Guns averaged more than [REDACTED]  
annual handgun sales from 2000 to 2017. ECF 84-1 [SEALED]. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] *Id.* [SEALED].

Moreover, what appears to be [REDACTED] are not  
explained by the FSA. For example, in 2016 the Rockville store derived [REDACTED] in gross revenue  
from handgun sales, but the following year, 2017, it derived [REDACTED]. Both years followed  
the HQL requirement. ECF 84-2 [SEALED]. Similarly, in the Silver Spring store, again excluding  
the two aberrant years, the average annual gross revenue from 2009 through 2017 was  
[REDACTED] and that number [REDACTED] *Id.* [SEALED].

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Atlantic Guns could establish that its business has declined  
since the HQL took effect, it has not adduced evidence to create a genuine issue of material fact  
that the decline is attributable to any regulatory burden placed on its customers' Second  
Amendment rights. In the other third party standing cases discussed above, the businesses'  
customers or some identified class of customers, were completely prohibited from availing  
themselves of the businesses' services. Here, the HQL requirement does not impose any  
categorical prohibition that constricted Atlantic Guns' buyers' market.

To be sure, the HQL licensing scheme requires customers to take certain steps before  
purchasing a handgun from Atlantic Guns. But, Atlantic Guns has not demonstrated that any  
customers who would have qualified ultimately decided against a purchase as a result of the